

THE NEW REPUBLIC.

VOL. 1.

CLEVELAND, APRIL 19, 1862.

NO. 2.

Education.

Before he determines upon the course to be pursued in a difficult medical case, the sagacious physician makes it his business to ascertain the constitutional peculiarities of his patient. He knows that the treatment which will cure one man may kill another, and he therefore rejects as unphilosophical and absurd the principle of applying the same rule to all cases of a like character. He has a system, however. It is adaptation. He measures the strength and observes the idiosyncrasies, physical and mental, of his patient, and upon these he bases his method of cure.

Education should be conducted upon the same plan. The mode in which a child should be taught and controlled depends upon its natural characteristics, and the parents, its earliest instructors, should study them carefully and adapt their teachings and moral government to the mental and moral qualities of their charge. In some children the reasoning faculties become active at a very early age, and by appealing to them in the right way they may soon be so strengthened and directed as to control the temper. Conscience, too, is sometimes wonderfully developed in childhood, and under proper religious training becomes a means, still more powerful than reason, of holding the passions of the young in check.

The two combined—well-directed reason and an active conscience—are the best safeguards of human happiness. They harmonize together, they act and re-act upon each other; and under their influence life, if not always sunny, is always honorable and self-satisfactory.

When the reason and conscience of a child are tardily developed, there are means of stimulating their growth. The most passionate children can be taught to reflect and compare, much more easily than is generally supposed. There are a hundred ways of illustrating the opposite and inevitable re-

sults of doing right and doing wrong, which a boy or girl of even four years old can understand.

The next step is to show why sorrow comes of what is wrong, and pleasure of what is right. This point reached, the onward and upward course becomes not only easy but pleasurable to the little pupil. The family is the great primary school, and the training which the child receives there, influences, in a majority of cases, the character of the individual in after-life.—*Waverly Magazine.*

Individuality.

There is an imperishable nature of Man, ever and everywhere the same, of which each particular man is a testimony and representation. As the solid earth underruns the "dissociating sea" and joins in one all sundered lands, so does this nature dip beneath the dividing parts of our being, and make all men one simple and inseparable humanity. In love, in friendship, in true conversation, in all happiness of communion between men, it is this unchangeable substratum or substance of man's being that is efficient and supreme: out of divers bosoms, same calls and replies to same with a great joy of self-recognition. It is only in virtue of this nature that men understand, appreciate, admire, trust each other,—that books of the earliest times remain true in the latest,—that society is possible; and he in whom the virtue of it dwells divinely, is admitted to the confidence of all bosoms, lives in all times, and converses with each soul and age in its own vernacular. Socrates looked beyond the gates of death for happy communion with Homer and all the great; but already we interchange words with these, whenever we are so sweetly prospered as to become, in some good degree, identical with the absolute nature of man.

Not only, moreover, is this immortal substance of man's being common and social, but it is so great and venerable that no one can match it with an equal report.—[D. A. Wasson, in *Atlantic Monthly*.]

The Right of Secession.

It seems to be supposed by some, that the principles which underlie the great rebellion of the South, are identical with those advocated by the Socialists of the North, those Radicals who have criticised the institution of Marriage, and claimed for the subjects of that institution a right to withdraw from its obligations and its bonds. They have consequently claimed that such is the legitimate result of our doctrines, and bid us look upon the bitter fruits of our tree of Liberty. But there are some even of those who speak in the name of freedom, who seem to be of the opinion that they belong together and that if we believe in the one we must necessarily support the other. For one I do not fancy such company, and I propose to inquire a little into the matter to ascertain, if we may, if it be indeed a truth that we belong in the same boat.

I think it is not claimed by the secessionists of the South, that they have a right under the Constitution to take the course they have, in thus withdrawing from the Union. It is their pretense that the Constitution has been violated in spirit if not in letter, by the North, and that therefore they have a right to withdraw from a compact which has not been fulfilled. The most strenuous advocate of State Rights, does not go so far as to assert that the right of secession or dissolution can be found in or justified by the articles of agreement between the States.

But while admitting there is no positive provision for dissolution or secession contained in the constitution itself, they maintain that it must be implied inasmuch as there is no direct prohibition of it, and no provision for punishment in case the assumed right is acted upon. If secession be unconstitutional, coercion is equally so, they assert. But this position involving the proposition that we have a government, but no power to govern—laws but no power to enforce law, is so glaring an absurdity, —so bold an impeachment of the common sense of the founders of our government, that it refutes itself in its very statement. If any one can believe the framers of the constitution guilty of the folly, the child's play of creating different departments of government, legislative, judicial, and executive, whose business it is to make, adjudge, and execute law, and yet with no power to enforce that law—defining treason, and announcing the punishment which shall be meted out to it, and yet with no power to administer that punishment—creating an army and navy for the defense of the government and people, and yet with no power to use that army and navy—if any man can believe this he is beyond

the reach of reason, and arguments are lost upon him. The very word government carries the ~~idea~~ of its function. It means nothing unless it implies the power to enforce its own rules of action.

There is then under the Constitution no right to secede, for if the right to secede be granted, there can be no right to coerce. There can be no punishment for that which is right, and the use of force to compel obedience can only be justified by the fact that it was wrong to disobey—that secession itself is a crime.

But how is secession a crime? It is a crime in that it is in violation of a contract—a breach of faith—insincerity, untruth, dishonesty, fraud.

The Constitution of the United States is the family compact—the articles of agreement between the different states; and the same common sense rules of common honesty which govern the contracts of individuals in partnerships, and corporations on a small scale should govern here. A republic is but a joint stock association—a company in which each member of the firm is a partner, and in which each is amenable to the organic law and is bound by and to each other for the fulfillment of that to which they may agree. The number who are partners, can make no difference in the obligations of the parties. Each member of the United States government—each citizen of the republic, is as much bound to abide by the articles of agreement, as though it were a contract between two individuals, and if they break it, it is just as much a violation of faith, and the principles of honor and honesty. You may say, perhaps, that it is not as important in the case of the nation that each member obey the law; that it matters not if here and there an individual should refuse obedience, when the great body of the people are faithful. Whereas in the case of two individuals the failure of one to perform his part of the stipulation involves and necessitates an entire failure of the enterprise. To which I reply that the interests involved in the fulfillment of a contract, increase in importance in proportion to the number of the parties interested in the contract; so that to embarrass or imperil a great enterprise in a slight degree, may be as great a wrong as to entirely overthrow one of no general consequence.

Individual insignificance is certainly a poor excuse for violated faith. And that philosophy is very questionable, which holds out a rule of action which only the few can follow without ensuring the destruction of all government, and whose only safety lies in the hope that others will be more honest and conscientious than yourself. I lay it down, then, as a correct principle of action, that no indi-

vidual or state has a right to disregard the organic law; or a contract to which he, or it is a party.

Further, every citizen of a republic is a party to every law of that republic, so long as he, of his own accord, helps to make those laws. And by this I do not mean that he himself must vote for every law specifically either himself or by delegation. If he vote on a law—if he vote for a representative, he commits himself unequivocally to the support—not of the law of his choice—but the law passed by the majority.

A law which he hates and detests, is as much his law so far as it affects the duty of obedience, as one which he approves. It is the majority, not the individual, that rules in a republic, and whoever takes a part in choosing law-makers thereby pledges himself to abide by the rule of the majority. The man therefore who refuses to obey the laws of the land after he has had a voice in the framing of these laws, acts a dishonorable part, and so of a state. Is there then, no such thing as individual or state sovereignty. No, not under a republic. The ideas are entirely incongruous. The thing is impossible. The rights of human beings are divided into two kinds; civil rights and natural rights, or the rights which man has as a citizen, and those which he has as a man. Civil rights are those which are guaranteed him by the government under which he lives.

In a republic the will of the majority is the government, and whatever rights that majority grants him, such the citizen is entitled to and nothing more. Natural rights are those which inhere in man as man—those which he holds as a child of God, or by virtue of the relation which he sustains to Nature. Life, Liberty and the pursuit of happiness furnishing, or including the great aims of existence, comprehend in a general sense all the natural rights. Among these rights, that of choosing the form of government under which they are to live, is one which in this nation is accredited to the people as a whole. The rights of the individuals, as individuals, to a choice in this matter, though not accredited perhaps, is as clear theoretically, or as a principle, as the right of the aggregate, but is more complicated and difficult in its application. The right of an individual living on the territory of a republic, to ignore the laws of that republic, on the ground that he takes no part in, and owes no allegiance to that government, will doubtless be questioned. But that a subject who chooses his own form of government and his own law-makers has no such right, is entirely demonstrable.

All men are endowed with certain natural rights but they have not always the power to retain them

unmolested. Consequently governments are instituted as a means of better preserving them. But it is entirely a chance business, and he who takes part in them, does so, if he understands himself, because he thinks it better on the whole, to run the risk of his natural rights being respected by those who have the power, than to attempt to retain all his natural rights with only the power of one individual to maintain them. Consequently he delegates his natural rights—all of them, to the keeping of others.

The will of the majority is the supreme law of the land in all cases whatsoever. Natural law ends where civil law begins, and natural rights end where civil rights begin. In other words civil law is the judge of what is natural law, and civil law or civil government resides not in individuals but in majorities; consequently natural rights in a republic are merely privileges vouchsafed by the majority. There are no natural rights—individual rights in a government of delegated authority.

Is there then no prevention against tyranny, no remedy for misrule? Yes, the forbearance of majorities, and a taking back of the delegated authority. In other words by revolution either peaceable or otherwise. Supposing that one of the parties to a contract whether an individual or a state, wishes to withdraw from the organization; how shall such a withdrawal be accomplished? Who are the proper ones to bring it about? Why the same parties who made the contract, of course. The parties who are to be affected by the proposed action. In the case of the Southern States there is no provision in the Constitution for their withdrawal; but as the Constitution is the mere creation of the popular will, there is nothing to prevent the people from accepting any change to which all parties can agree. And for one I must say that had the Southern States made a peaceable proposition for separation, and proposed a mutual consideration and arbitration of all questions which would arise for settlement, a proper deference to natural rights and the principles of self government, would have dictated the most respectful consideration of the proposal. I will say further, that if the people of the South were unanimous in the desire to govern themselves, and were ready to make good all the damages which had been sustained on account of the copartnership relation, there is no principle of right or justice which could hold them against their will. Had they assumed this position, then indeed were we of the North, as they claim, oppressors and tyrants, enacting towards them the same line of policy which George the Third pursued toward us. Our President considers it "not a free love arrange-

ment," but a marriage for life and therefore indissoluble. But I can see no principle, either of property or natural justice which would force people, either two, or thirty millions to a loathed and hated union when all the ends for which that union was formed have become entirely unattainable. The same right to that course of life which would best promote the ends of existence, which justified the union in the first place, would under the changed circumstances, justify the dissolution of that union. And those who made the contract are the ones to decide whether and how it shall be annulled. No England has a right to interfere, either to forbid the banns or to bring about a dissolution, either from a distaste to democratic etiquette and republican license, or a jealousy of the growing proportions of the young Giant, and fear for the balance power in the political world. The Monroe doctrine or all there is of it which is based upon natural justice, is as applicable to unions on a small as on a large scale. Nations are made up of individuals, and the same common sense principles of equity are applicable to both. All questions of dissolution either individual or national involve, first the principles of natural justice, founded upon human rights; and, secondly, those of conventional equity, based upon contracts or conventional obligations. Grant the natural right to secede; it does not by any means follow that the order of secession is of no moment. The man who, after fulfilling all the obligations which are in his power to fulfill as a husband and a parent; after consultation and in pursuance of a mutual agreement, leaves his partner because he can neither subserve his own happiness nor hers, nor the interests of his children by staying with her—this man has a heaven born right—a right against the Universe, to secede. And this principle of right the individuals who make up a state carry with them into the government which they adopt.

But the man who, regardless alike of his legal and his moral obligations, intent only on his own happiness, deserts his companion and leaves her to struggle with the world alone; to earn a subsistence unaided for herself and *his* children—such a man has richly earned the execrations of his kind. And if any man deserved damnation, temporal and eternal—hemp in this world and hell in the next, it is he.

And this in a national point of view is just the position which indignant and chivalric Secession now occupies. How does she propose to dissolve the partnership into which she had entered? By mutual consent, an arbitration of all differences, an equitable division of the property, and an assumption

of all the debts contracted on her account? Such is the course prescribed by common honesty and the most ordinary courtesy. Instead of this the North is not even consulted in the matter. Judging that she could doubtless make better terms for herself, alone, than by troublesome consultation, she concluded to make her own bargain and force the other party to sign it. These terms were to hold all the property in her possession, no matter whose money paid for it, to steal all she could get into her hands before she made known her purpose to her partner, in addition, and to repudiate all her obligations both corporate and individual. To get all she could of the common property, either by secret theft or open robbery, by treachery, treason, marauding and murder—then slope and set up for herself, all the while rolling up her eyes to heaven, playing the innocent, invoking the spirit of freedom, and claiming it as a legitimate application of the principles of self-government, and crying out "Let me alone," "Let me alone," "Invasion! Coercion! Tyranny!" Shame on the lying, whining hypocrites! Common swindlers and highwaymen are kings to them, for they make no pretense to virtue or principle.

The fact that this Southern movement is unconstitutional and illegal is the least that can be said against it. It is a violation of human law for the sake of defying Divine law. It is unconstitutional or extra constitutional in the idea itself; it is mean and despicable, dishonorable and contemptible in its method, but the atrocity of the thing culminates in the end at which it aims. It is revolution. But revolution for a noble purpose is a noble thing. A revolution in favor of Human Rights—to subserve human good, is a glorious thing. There is a moral grandeur in a heroic struggle for a noble purpose; in the sacrifice of fortune, honor, and life itself to a great principle. The blood which is shed in such a cause becomes sanctified by the motive which prompts it.

In itself considered a revolution is a thing to be deprecated and deplored. None but the highest motives; a lofty purpose and a noble end can ever compensate for those evils which always follow in the train of war. With the best of motives and the highest object the *necessity* of any war is a thing to be deplored. What then shall be said of a people who recklessly plunge a nation into strife—who plot revolutions, inaugurate the reign of anarchy and bloodshed, and involve all the horrors of war, fire, sword and famine, not to elevate and ennoble humanity—not to extend the area of freedom and increase the means of happiness, but to gratify the basest of human proclivities, the disposition to tyrannize over the weak and defenceless, to

plunder the poor, to shirk the duties of life, and live on the labor of others, that they may live in ease and fatten in luxury, on the unpaid toil of their neighbors. Yes, everybody knows that slavery and the desire to continue unmolested in its privileges is the root of this matter. That word tells the whole story. It will not do that the North has granted her immunity, to the extent of the contract. It is not enough that she consent to be silent, aye, to help her, (if need be) while she flays the six that are in the bond. She must have the seventh victim and additional room to flourish her whips and chains. It will not do that the North has rolled in the dust so long that she has lost the use of her limbs, and could not stand erect if she would. She must not even get on to her knees to pray for additional strength. The attitude is offensive and unconstitutional—a direct insult to the South and merits a kick from the chivalry. It will not do that her churches and court houses, her pulpit, press, and bar are in chains; her mountians yet stand, and her birds and breezes, as yet unchained, are a constant reproach to the system. It is not enough that the North is silent. She still *thinks* and must be threshed for that. Slavery is a war upon everything that is noble and good in man, and every thing that thinks and feels is its natural enemy. With a native instinct for darkness it clutches its victim, sneaks to its den and cries out, "Let me alone!" It cannot be. Too late, too late, O Thou Spirit of Darkness! Long has the sword of Eternal Justice hung suspended over thy guilty head! And now that thy own frenzied arm has whetted the steel to an unwonted keenness, thy time has come! Thy death warrant is issued! The places which know thee now shall know thee no more forever! Thy crimes have at last wrought their just desert! Right at last comes uppermost! Thy prayer is answered, O trusting one! Hope smiles again, and jeered and throttled Faith, downcast and drooping, looks up with confidence; Justice is done on earth and men no longer walk abroad and say, "There is no God."

C. M. OVERTON.

Random Thoughts on the Times.

MR. EDITOR:—This is a good year to sow the seeds of earnestness and to reap an abundant harvest of high and holy purpose. The earnestness of the battle field now sounds the key note of American music. It is not now confined to a John Brown, a Gerrit Smith, a Garrison and a little band everywhere spoken against, who incessantly proclaim that God is God, and right is right; but this earnestness spreads over the length and breadth of the land, reaching the remotest hamlet or rural nook that has offered a father, husband, son or brother to swell the army of progress and liberty. For nearly a centu-

ry the oppressed of Europe have watched America as the star of hope, and have flocked to our shores as the Land of Promise. The eyes of the world are upon us, either in jealous hate or sympathetic, prayerful hope. The friends of freedom every where have looked with apprehension and alarm upon the rise and progress of aristocracy and despotism in the "land of the free and the home of the brave." But the interest felt in the struggle is intense beyond the power of words to express, now that the aristocracy has attempted to drain the life-blood of the nation, dethrone Liberty and compel, for their idol slavery, the homage of mankind. It seems sad and strange that so many who think themselves loyal to the best interests of the nation, worship this idol instead of the Living God. But the nation begins to hate the idol and think seriously of removing it from the capitol, and half a million soldiers delight to deal their heaviest blows upon the head of this false god.

What a change. Less than three years ago the little army of freedom, that took hammer in hand and went down to break this idol in pieces, was called "the John Brown raid." Others had spoken bravely and true, while they tamely submitted to be caned both in Congress and out of Congress; but "Old John Brown" was the first to meet the foe with his own weapons on his own soil, and gain a glorious victory, for in all truth he might have said while on the scaffold, "I came, I saw, I conquered."

There has always been a flaw in the Union, and it never can be cemented until the interests and aspirations of the whole country become the same. To the patriot and the philanthropist it is a great satisfaction to see so many things tending to this result. A radical change of condition causes a corresponding change in our aspirations, modes of thought, and entire life. On this principle, those who have loved slavery well may learn to love freedom better, and they who have been mortal enemies in life may become immortal friends in death. The black race may cease to fear and hate the whites, while the latter may learn to recognize in the former a humility, a patient sufferance, a harmony and beauty of soul that shall command their admiration and respect; and the races learn to occupy the relative position that shall best promote the welfare of both; while it robs neither of its rights, color or other peculiarities. An open, earnest war, like the present, promises a more speedy and lasting peace, than did the suppressed war of races and interests before.

To the thoughtful mind, the evidence is irresistible that this war, thorough and complete, will be immediately followed by a more lasting peace, a better culture, a higher civilization than the world has ever known. The sight of a great army is grand and sublime; but far more grand and glorious is the march of Progress and the triumphs of Peace that a glimpse of Destiny unfolds. The earnest, united, prayer for individual and national advancement is a sure prophecy of its fulfillment. And when we become sufficiently cultivated ourselves and our mental vision is clear then we shall see every mortal as an embryo angel, and tender to every one the recognition of a loving brotherhood and a hearty good will.

G. R.

No Socialist and Not Much of a Reformer.

"All negative, that title," says one, "bad sign; why don't you affirm something?" Be patient, my dear friend; perhaps, I give the "no" this prominence, in order that the "yes" may be more emphatic. But please hear me before judging.

The dictionaries define Socialist to be one who advocates community of property among all the citizens of a State. According to this definition, the two words socialist and communist mean about the same thing. But such is not the meaning that is usually attached to the word Socialist, now-a-days. We make it include, not only communists, but associationists of the Fourier school, and individualists of the Warren school. By the term socialist, I understand one who advocates the transformation of society by the application of some newly-discovered principle, or system of principles, which has not been generally recognized in practice, heretofore. A Socialist, as I understand him, looks upon human society as a machine which he and his co-adjudicators may take to pieces and reconstruct, so as to produce new political, commercial, and social results, just as a mechanic might re-model a manufacturing establishment so as to produce a different kind of fabric. This, I believe, is precisely what Socialists mean everywhere, when they talk of RE-CONSTRUCTION. According to this use of the term, I am no Socialist.

"What, then, are you," asks one; "tell us something that you do believe in."

Well, while I do not believe that society is a machine to be modeled in an arbitrary manner by the will, I do believe that it is a vital, living thing, imbued with certain natural and inalienable elements of activity which result in social progress or development. I believe, therefore, in the growth of society,—not in the sudden transition of social and political forms amongst a hundred human beings at Hopedale, Oneida, Berlin Heights, or elsewhere, but in the gradual unfolding, or growth of institutions or usages amongst great masses of the human race. Nations, even, grow by the action of inevitable law. Sir James Macintosh said, "Constitutions are not made but grow." The idea was new, then, but it is accepted now by every thorough student of political history. In like manner social institutions are not made, but grow. Grow by virtue of inherent law, and the historical facts which are the living result of such law, may be observed, catalogued, compared, systemized, generalized, reduced to science. Therefore, I believe in Social Science; and so far as I have leisure and ability to be, I am a SOCIOLOGIST.

The term Sociology was, I believe, introduced by Comte, who, though profound and correct in his general methods, yet failed as signally as Owen or Fourier to build up a system of scientific Sociology; —the term, however, is rapidly coming into general use to designate the systematic knowledge of social

institutions and social destiny. The difference, then, between the position of a Socialist and that of Sociologist is very distinct, and may be summed up in a few words.

The Socialist appears to get his ideas of social change chiefly from a kind of inspiration, or from reflections on his own feelings; the new conditions of his ideal, which he wishes to enjoy, he believes may be brought about to a great extent by a few persons uniting together for the purpose. The Sociologist, on the contrary, gets his ideas of social change from the teachings of history and the analogies of science, using his own feelings, and the feelings of those about him as objectively as he would use a fact of history or a principle of science. He holds that no change can be healthy and successful which has not a long foreground of preparation, and which does not effect considerable portions of mankind simultaneously. The position of the Socialist is that of an ill-informed, though usually well-meant enthusiasm; the position of the Sociologist is that which he is compelled to take, (whether in accordance with his personal preferences or not), by inexorable necessities of truly scientific methods.

Now, with reference to not being much of a Reformer. I believe that a Reformer is a very useful member of society, since his function appears to be to change from worse to better, to amend ways and manners, to dissuade from vice, &c. But the business of the Reformer, as I understand it, is, for the most part, a superficial one; he labors with the twigs, lopping, and bending, and shaping,—giving all his energy to the top and surface, forgetting the while to look deeper, though the roots are forever sending forth the nutritive currents which reproduce and sustain the very excrescences and distortions, he is struggling with such zeal and application to remove. I should prefer in my poor way to do a more radical work; a work which I would wish to be scientific, and indirectly, rather than directly, reformatory.

Another reason why I do not care to be much of a Reformer, is that the work of reform, seems, for the most part to be a negative one. Reformers deal too exclusively with evils; they battle with wrong, attacking it in a direct way. I should prefer a more positive work. It's unpleasant to occupy one's life with the contemplation of errors; it is surely more beautiful and ennobling to dwell with a rational reverence, on the inter-related systems of unfolding thought as they rise luminous and distinct on the great field of Positive Truth. There is in this a quiet elation of feeling, which, the negative reformer, in the exercise of his profession can never know. While it satisfies our love of truth, it pleases the artistic faculties of our nature, and thrills the poetic, with a breadth and depth of power as nothing else can. And, furthermore, a simple statement of truth, may in the end, prove infinitely more revolutionary, and redound more to the real progress of society, than

the direct attack upon existing evils by a whole regiment of Reformers. The mightiest powers of the Universe act as calmly and silently as a sunbeam.—But, please do not mistake me ; I undervalue the work of none ; I only speak for myself.

There is still another reason for my not wishing to be much of a Reformer, and that has reference to the type of character which Reformers have made for themselves by a kind of habitual and constitutional moroseness of temper, criticising and finding fault with everything and everybody. There is nothing right with your genuine, out and out reformer. It is his profession to make things right, and his business, consequently, to find things wrong. There is not a political or social institution that he does not wish to annihilate, or tinker with in his arbitrary way. He wants to tear the machinery out of our governmental establishments, and put in new by the job,—just as if he could,—just as if governments were not as much the result of law and growth as a tree or an animal. He is all in a bluster to kick the life out of the Church,—just as if the church had not a vitality in the existing state of the popular mind which can only be modified by the gradual illumination of science and general education. He has no more patience with our social institutions, pitching into them, as if he meant to demolish them, before they had run their allotted course. Ostensibly in opposition to sectism, he is himself a sectist of the truest dye. He has found the truth, fixed, absolute, well-defined, and he is bound that every body else shall accept it. In faith he tolerates only what he believes himself; in works, what he wants to practice. He touches nothing but with the ever present consciousness of his great mission as a Reformer. Finding fault becomes a confirmed habit of mind. He no longer looks at the beautiful in things, but only at their blemishes. It is not in his mind to admire and enjoy the actual, but to find fault and overturn. He loves his profession ; and comes, at length, not only to condemn things but persons. If you meet him for the first time he does not seek to make himself agreeable, but rather to pick some flaw in your ideas, get into a discussion, and display his prowess by monopolizing the talk, and overwhelming you with a torrent of words. In addressing the public, he does not hesitate to startle, shock, and wound. This is only too true of too many of our lecturing reformers ; as, in such the views of the profession seem to culminate. To such an extent does this obtain, that many of our gentlemanly and lady-like people, and truth-loving as well, who have had considerable of experience with professional reformers, have come to dread them as a class. Habitually combative, they don't know how to be, can't be, or don't care to be gentlemanly and lady-like in their bearing towards others. Still, I am not for outlawing the reformer of the ultra type ; he will do well enough for him—only give him elbow-room.

"Then, if not much of a Reformer," asks one, quizzing me, "what are you?"

I would be, if I could, a gentleman in the true sense of the word—a man of culture. I know of nothing higher than this to aspire to. Do not think that the man of culture is a ninny, an accomplished nobody. More than any other has he prepared and carried on the work of advancing civilization. The most we have, we owe to him ; and the most the world will ever have, will be due to him. I refer to integral culture,—that which enlightens, refines, ennobles, and strengthens the whole man. The true gentleman is no coward, but a very hero, if need be. He speaks his honest thoughts, and does his brave deed when there is occasion ; but with all charity for human foibles, he is careful to avoid all needless offense. He would combine as far as possible the obligation he owes to truth, with the tenderest regard for the feelings of others. In being just to all the faculties of his being, and just to the many around him, the thoroughness of his culture avouches its own dignity, and crowns him truly a man.

Dear Reader ;—If, in the spirit of this article, I have violated the lineaments of my ideal, I beg your pardon upon the plea that the relics of old habits still linger about me ! I hope to improve.

J. S. P.

The Paper at Club Price.

We have been admonished that the price of our paper was too low. In a sense it is; but the only way to secure a large circulation is to publish a two dollar paper for one dollar. This we shall do, but we consider one dollar the CLUB PRICE, and those who have a special interest in the paper will do as much as to pay two dollars for it ; either by earning the other dollar in procuring subscribers, or by paying for additional copies for circulation, or for such appreciative persons as would not otherwise have the paper. Our club terms are the easiest imaginable. We will take any number of subscribers, and for any length of time, at the same rate. How many will send us clubs, and how many will send an extra dollar for two or four friends, three or six months each ?

Costly Government.

The Cincinnati Gazette in discussing the question of retrenchment, states that the five leading offices of Hamilton County pay, in the aggregate, sixty five thousand dollars. Now it seems to us that there is little use in cutting down a little here and there. All that will be gained that way will hardly pay the Legislature for the time it spends in discussing the question. The cheapest and best way entirely is to abolish these offices altogether.

THE NEW REPUBLIC.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, APRIL 19, 1862.

THE NEW REPUBLIC is published weekly, at one dollar a year; six months, fifty cents; single copies (post paid) three cents.

Office, No. 236, Superior Street.

Remittances should be made in bills of Ohio, Eastern, Indiana State, or Detroit banks, Treasury notes, coin or stamps. Address.

NEW REPUBLIC,
CLEVELAND, Ohio.

Who are Reformers?

The remarks of Prof. Powell, and those of our very analytical and logical correspondent, J. S. P. suggest a few thoughts under this head. Words are what may be appropriately termed necessary inconveniences. We have to use them, sometimes, for want of better means of communication. The plan adopted in the Spirit world—if we can credit certain theories and statements—that of reading each other's thoughts, seems a very good one; decidedly better than our practice of using words, which at best very often only serve to confound, and insure misunderstanding and miscomprehension; and I suggest that we adopt it as soon and as far as practicable. Lest I be thought an ultra reformer, I will state, distinctly and positively, that I am in favor of its gradual and not its immediate adoption. The word reformer I suppose properly applies to one who does not think that established institutions and commonly received ideas are so correct as to be incapable of beneficial modification. The man who is not a reformer thinks that it is best to take things as they are, and believes that though imperfect, they cannot well be improved. That this definition includes a very large proportion of society I admit. And it is true that a large proportion of society are reformatory, in some direction and to some extent. As to the kind of reformer a man is, that is another question. Hardly any one, even the ultraist reformer, so called, but is conservative on some one or more questions. And before calling a man a reformer, we never think of insisting that he shall favor all so-called reforms.

Still the term reformer, like many other terms, has come to mean very little; and I take it that it will pay to spend very little time in discussing the question as to who are reformers and who are not. For one I care very little for names. I am a Reformer, a Christian, an Infidel, an Abolitionist, a Socialist, a Radical, a Conservative, or just the opposite of each; all depending upon how you use the terms. And I am very indifferent as to what I am called, for the very reason that the meaning of one, who uses any of these terms, is just the opposite of that

of another. So far as anybody is interested to know my views, I will give them as well as terms and my ability to use them, will allow. After hearing me through, they may call it what they please. Let us cease longer to make a great account of names. We all have some truth. Let us have a free toleration of opinion, and a free, and fraternal, and appreciative interchange of ideas; and the time is not far distant when party spirit and sectism shall give place to unity and brotherhood.

Wendell Phillips' Lecture.

Melodeon Hall was, on the occasion of Wendell Phillips' lecture, packed to its utmost capacity, by an apparently highly intelligent and appreciative audience. Eloquent, accomplished, logical, Wendell Phillips deserves no praise for being; he could not help being all these, at least it is likely he never did. So far as bravery is concerned, it seemingly required none to utter radical truths, when the most radical were the heartiest applauded; but it need not be said that the utterance would have been all the same had the reception been different. Doubtless essentially the same sentiments were uttered that excited the fury of the mob on a recent occasion, in a neighboring city. Though it was not the sentiments uttered that made the disturbance, for the mob had prejudged the case,—or rather the influences that controlled the mob, for mobs never think—and had come prepared with weighty and odorous arguments, that are so potent when presented in opposition to free speech. Strange that such a speaker as Wendell Phillips, whatever his sentiments might be, should excite any other feeling than admiration. Probably no two men in the Country have called out more invective and denunciation than Wendell Phillips and William Lloyd Garrison; and yet no two men can be found who exhibit greater mildness of demeanor, or Christ-likeness of character. We can give no report of Mr. Phillips' speech. Suffice it to say that only one thought intruded itself during the delivery, and that was of phonography and wider columns. May Wendell Phillips live to make many speeches, and may our readers all live to hear him.

Pardoned.

The Rev. GEORGE GORDON, recently confined in the jail in this City, for obstructing the execution of the Fugitive Slave Law, has been pardoned by President LINCOLN. It is to be hoped that Cleveland has been disgraced for the last time by the execution of this diabolical law.

The Next Number.

The next Number will be dated and issued, in its regular order, April twenty sixth.

The Fallen Angel.

BY T. L. HARRIS.

A city rocked in the earthquake's din,
Its roofs and its pinnacles toppling in:
A shattered ship, with its ghastly freight,
Slow sinking down 'neath the tempest's weight:
A nation mown by the scythe of war,
With its children bound to the victor's car:
A people crowding the halls of death,
Heaped like pale leaves by the famine's breath:
O, these are awful, and dread to see!
But a darker vision I bring to thee.

A living babe on the pale cold breast
Of its mother, frozen to marble rest:
A starving child, while the sleet falls hoar,
Driven with blows from the rich man's door:
A prisoner bound in the dungeon halls,
Where no ray of hope or sunshine falls:
A martyr chained to the crackling pyro,
While the mob grow drunken with blood and ire:
Oh, these are awful, and dread to see!
But a darker vision I bring to thee.

A gentle girl, with her dove-like eyes,
Blooms 'neath the glow of her home's glad skies:
Her heart o'erbrimming with love divine,
As a diamond chalice with precious wine:
But the spoiler comes with his specious wiles,
Like a demon wails, like an angel smiles:
Then blossoms the soul of that beautiful one,
As a rose unfolds 'neath the ardent sun:
And her life grows joyous,—but woe is me,—
Dark is the vision I show to thee!

She has left her home: she has made her nest
In the fancied troth of that chosen breast:
But his love was lust, and his troth a lie:
He sates his passion and flings her by.
He flings her by, and his leprous kiss
Blisters at last, and with demon hiss
He bids her live,—O, treacherous breath!
On the price of virtue,—the sale of death!
Dark is the vision I show to thee,
But a darker sight there is yet to see.

"I'm spoiled by falsehood, not leagued with sin;
I will seek my home; it will fold me in:
It will not be long, for this aching grief,"
She murmurs, "will bring me the cypress wreath."
But, ah! she is scorned from her father's door!
The bosom that fed her will own her no more.
And her old companions breath her name
With a scornful sneer and a word of shame.
Dark is the vision I show to thee,
But a darker shadow is there to see.

Her soul grew wild with that last despair;
Her lips moved then, but it was not prayer:
"They drive me with curses from virtue's way;
I was once betrayed, I will now betray."
She nerved with the wine-up her thin frail form,
She wreathed her lips with a dazzling scorn,
She sold her charms in the streets at night:
Her lips were poison, her glances blight.
Dark is the vision I show to thee
And its closing shadow is yet to see.

The sleet swept bleak through the silent morn.
O'er a dying form and a dying heart;
She sank on the pavement cold and bare;
Her shroud was wove by the snowy air:
The scornful lips and the woe-worn face
Smoothed down into childhood's peaceful grace.
The guilty, here spurned the child of sin,
But the ANGELS there bade her welcome in.
Dark is the vision I've pictured thee;
What hast thou done that it may not be?

A New Book.

We have received from the Author—Warren Chase, a neat little book of 116 pages, entitled "*The Fugitive Wife*: A criticism on Marriage, Adultery and Divorcee." It is an able essay on this vitally important subject. No one interested in the purity and happiness of the domestic relation—and who is not—and who feels that some remedy is needed for the present deplorable state of things, and who believes that investigation of the causes may possibly in some way lead to the cure, fail to procure a copy of this little work; or rather two copies, one for an ornament to the library, and the other to be worn out in lending. We have not learned the price of the work; will ascertain and state in a future number.

Published and for sale by Bela Marsh, 14 Bromfield St., Boston, and by the Author.

Who Write the Articles?

A correspondent writes: "I hope you will give us the names of contributors in connection with their articles. I do not know how it is with others, but for myself there are few things that annoy me more than reading a good article and not being able to tell to whom I am indebted for the pleasure." This feeling is a common, natural and legitimate one. But it will be for contributors to decide for themselves whether they shall give their names. One thing is certain—no contribution will appear without some signature and no article will be copied without credit. At present there is but one Editor. If in the future, as is likely, there should be editorials written by different persons, there will be some way to distinguish them.

One Word More.

We do not propose to dictate to our readers in regard to their duty, not even their great duty of procuring subscribers for the **NEW REPUBLIC**. We have an idea that if we make it worth people's attention, there will be a demand for it. But a word by way of suggestion; and that is this, that large numbers of persons may be induced to subscribe for a short time, say three months, who, for one reason or another, would not subscribe for a longer time, and not at all without being solicited; but who would like the Paper and continue it. We are receiving some large clubs of this sort, and they are proof of what can be done. "A word *etc.*"

COVINGTON, KY., April, 1862.

MR. EDITOR:—Although I have permitted my name to go to you as a contributor to your paper, yet I do not wish to commit myself in its columns, before defining my position in relation to the public. I have learned that your paper is to advocate reforms. I have seen many papers that professed to advocate reforms, either especially or generally, and in many instances I have found them doing more to deform than to reform. Hence I have acquired a prejudice to the word, because it came to signify a change from one extreme to another. But in my opinion, change, however great, is not always reform, and revolution is not necessarily progress. I have a strong suspicion that all professedly reformatory movements are but modified forms of rebellion, and with rebellion, no matter how disguised, I have no sympathy. *

Formation in the natural order of things must precede reformation; the time therefore, has not arrived for us as a people, to begin the work of reformation, because our institutions are as yet but in a state of progress or formation—they have not arrived at completion. At present, therefore, it is our duty to look on and contribute—the people are the architects of our institutions, and they must have time and materials, and those who are interested in the work should observe its progress, and if they find an imperfect brick they should announce it to the architect, that he may have it replaced by a sound one—that is, if an error be found in our institutions it should be replaced with truth. A house may not be perfect, and yet to a family it may be preferable to no house. The proper indication then is, repair it, and finally if it cannot be made what it should be, then reform or rebuild. That in all of our institutions there are errors I doubt not, and I am an advocate of the correction of them, and my business, in the relation I hold to society is to indicate as many of them as I can, and I may even indicate the remedy—the people will discuss truth, and in due season will furnish such institutions as may best answer the ends for which they were intended.

The people, as I have remarked, are the architects of our social institutions, but as yet they have been but poorly furnished with the essential materials, except, possibly, in two relations, religion and politics, for hitherto our popular press has been almost exclusively confined to these subjects. With reference to our institutions, my desire is that the people be abundantly supplied with materials, viz:—the truth upon all subjects. When this shall be had I will trust its elaboration to them.

From what I have learned, Mr. Editor, your enterprise is not to be confined to either religion or politics, but to the dissemination of useful information on all subjects. Hence it must be useful. Therefore I greet it with unfeigned pleasure.

Those who must supply the popular mind with

valuable information on subjects outside of the circle of the every-day intercourse of life, are comparatively few. They are those who have labored in dredging the profoundest depths of nature in her various departments for her consecrated but invaluable truths, and it has been wisely ordained that a few of such laborers should be sufficient to keep the species talking and thinking for the advancement of the whole.

Nature consists of a great variety of departments, and for their investigation respectively many varieties of the human mind have obtained, and by their united labors the arts and sciences necessary to the advancement of civilization are produced. The department to which I have mostly devoted my life is anthropology, and from this source I am willing to assist in the construction of our institutions. I desire to repair and improve, but not to reform.

My contributions will for some time have relation to the great fundamental institution of society, Marriage. I will begin with it.

CHAPTER I.
MARRIAGE—ITS ORIGIN. BY W. BYRD POWELL,
M. D.

Marriage, by the common law, has been regarded as a civil institution, and as having had its origin in civil society; but at present common law writers are beginning to entertain more correct views on the subject; they now teach that marriage is a contract having its origin in a law of nature, antecedent to all civil institutions; but adopted by political society, and charged thereby with various civil obligations.

This adoption of the institution by political society, has greatly damaged it, by excessive swaddling. Consequently it has lost much of its inherent character, and that which remains has become so doveltailed into the institution of goods and chattles, as to have measurably become a part of it.

If marriage had its origin in civil society, then it should be treated as strictly a social institution, and should be subject to social or conventional regulations. It has, I believe, been contended that the institution of marriage had its origin in the Church. But this I am sure is a mistake. At present, however, it is made a sacrament by the Greek and Catholic Churches.

If it shall be shown to have originated independently of both Church and State, then it should not be held amenable to either, but to those laws under which it originated.

Believing the marriage institution to be exclusively natural, I will now attempt to show that such is the fact—that it exists in obedience to an ordinance of Nature, and consequently, as an institution it should exist with an entire independence of both religious and political restraints.

By a law of human mind we refer similar phenomena to similar causes, and a sound philosophy both sustains and sanctions this law; if, then, mar-

riage be a conventional institution with man, it should be conceded to have had the same origin, to the extent it obtains amongst the inferior animals. That the institution obtains with many species of the inferior animals, is most notoriously a fact. The institution is as proper to the fox, the badger, the stark, heron and domestic pigeon, and some other animals, as it is to man; and it is very certain that religion had no agency in founding the institution with the animals above named, and to me it is equally certain that social conventions had no agency in the premises: because the inferior animals are not endowed with either the religious or social sentiments; and consequently they have neither religious nor social institutions.

With many of the inferior animals the institution obtains only during the season of reproduction. But with those I have named, it is perpetual, or during the lives of the parties, respectively; and the fox hunters of Virginia assured me that they had never seen two male or two female foxes together, but that invariably when two were seen together, they were of the respective sexes,—that the individuals of the respective sexes obtain companions young in life, and live with them through life, with a fidelity that might well bring a blush of shame upon the cheeks of many bipeds who claim to be more rational.

Several modes of life are observable in the animal creation; that of the ox, buffalo, elk, deer, sheep, goat, hog, horse, and some other animals, is exclusively herding or gregarious; that of the fox and badger is exclusively domestic; that of the stark, heron, pigeon, and some other animals, is both domestic and herding. In this class we may include savage man, because his social sentiments are too rudimental to elevate him to the social state; and civilized man we find invariably living in both the domestic and social states.

It will not, I think, be disputed that marriage with the inferior animals is natural, the result of instincts which inhere in them. It now becomes pertinent to inquire what there is in the economy of some of the inferior animals, that should render the marriage union of the respective sexes necessary? I answer, young foxes, badgers, stark, herons and pigeons, are very tender and helpless, so much so as to render the care of both progenitors indispensable. But they are not more so than are the young of the human species, nor does their helplessness continue so long.

If, then, the preservation of species have made the alliance of the respective sexes necessary to some of the inferior species, it cannot, and will not, I presume, be contended that the marriage institution is less essential to the human species. I cannot see how the conclusion can be philosophically avoided, that marriage is one of nature's provisions for the preservation of the species. There is another provision which is still more indicative of wisdom, viz: the natural mind of all species of animals, from man

down to the most inconsiderable insect, is endowed with a philoprogenitive instinct—a love of progeny. The male minds of those species to which marriage is an institution, are also endowed with this faculty. To this faculty infancy is more indebted for its preservation, than to all the other provisions instituted for the same purpose.

The mental function of inference is a law, a necessity of the human mind,—one that can neither be avoided nor resisted; and it is by this necessity that I am impelled to infer from the preceding facts and analogies, that the institution of human marriage is natural—as purely instinctive as the propensity to feed or drink—nor do I think the legitimacy of this inference can be consistently doubted.

Marriage is a union of two individuals of the respective sexes for life; at least, it is so understood. Hence those who take upon themselves its obligations must, according to the outside swathings to which I have alluded, continue united, however discordant their dispositions, or vicious their constitutions. Never, since the procreative function began, has it been possible for progenitors thus constituted to produce anything better than rebellious and unhappy minds, intellectual and moral monsters. It is reasonable, I think, to attribute our Southern rebellion to the restraints which society and religion have imposed on the marriage institution.

In confirmation of my convictions in this relation, I have a pertinent fact. The most intellectual and extensively informed and educated lady I ever saw or made the acquaintance of, made a visit to our country from Europe, by the way of Hayti, and sojourned for some time in Port au Prince. She informed me that in that place marriage was of two kinds; natural, by the parties themselves, and religious, by the Catholic Church—that divorces from the former were exceedingly rare, but that from the latter they were so frequent that the Government had become prejudiced against them.

The natural marriages were contracted by the parties and consummated without ceremony, formality or publicity; the parties respectively retaining the right to dissolve the engagement at any time, and yet it was very rarely done. I do not avouch the above statement, but because of my confidence in the capacity of the lady for correct discrimination, and also in her veracity, and farther because it harmonises with my convictions in the premises, I believe it.

All institutions without distinction, are amenable to laws which are in kind the same with the institutions they respectively govern. The institution of marriage is now exclusively under a socially conventional government, and this would be right if the institution were of social origin. But as it has been shown that the institution is exclusively natural even beyond the reach of impertinent criticism hence the present government of the institution is as great an error as it would be to place our social

relations under a military government. The parties to a marriage, as individuals, like all other individuals, should of course be amenable to the social relations under which they live; but as to their married relation, neither Church nor State should have anything to do with it.

Having shown that the connubial relation of the sexes is natural, it follows that it is at the disposal of the parties; they may continue or sever it when it can no longer serve the purpose for which it was contracted. The paramount purpose of the marriage institution is conceded by all parties to be procreation, and I admit that this function may be continued under the restraints of both Church and State, but will the results be normal in both mind and body? I respond, nay,—nay,—nay.

I view this question exclusively as an anthropologist. The good of the species, I hold to be paramount. When States have to be constantly building asylums, for idiots, imbeciles, lunatics and malefactors, and cemeteries for premature mortality, there can be but little room left for a serious doubt that the source of life is exceedingly abnormal; and the many indicies of this abnormality by which we are surrounded, should arouse every one to an examination of the subject.

The institution of marriage has been so exclusively under Legislative control, that no one appears to have seriously doubted that it is a social institution. Consequently the true character of the institution has escaped suspicion, and hence the laws by which it is, or should be, governed, are yet probably to be discovered.

I have shown the institution to be natural; but as nature consists of very many departments, it becomes indispensable that we should discover the one by which this institution is embraced; otherwise we will not be able to indicate its laws. We can succeed in this inquiry by obtaining a clear conception of the functions of the institution. The first and paramount function of the institution is conceded to be procreation, and all that follows, as nourishing, training, &c., is of the same generic character, viz: Physiological. The institution is then embraced by the physiological department of nature. The laws, then, that govern the institution, are physiological, and in my subsequent contributions, it will be in place and time to show that the results of delinquency to those laws, are idiocy, imbecility, insanity, moral depravity, and all scrofulous forms of disease. It is generally supposed that those laws are so occult that a knowledge of them must ever be confined to the medical profession. This is a great error, for I positively aver, that I can in one month qualify any clever Miss of ten summers to avoid a marriage that would produce either of the preceding results. It is with extreme mortification that I am compelled to add that my professional brethren know as little about this subject as do other people, and I have no indication that the fact will ever be otherwise.

Law and the Higher Law.

From time immemorial mankind have sanctioned human law-givers, and complied with the requirements of the laws they gave. This has been well; direction was indispensable. Still it is requisite, that order may be maintained. But we have too long been defrauded by statutes originating in sordid and ambitious natures. The weakest of the masses, those most in need of guidance and protection, can be better served by magnanimous decrees. It matters less to the strong-minded and brave, as they can better serve themselves—still less to those who have become a law unto themselves, yet these are better off without any statutes, than with bad ones; hence, good laws are very important, whatever the phase of development. In the proportion that legislators have been wise and humane, have States and Nations been prosperous. Ancient and modern times are alike evidences of this—Monarchies and Republics alike attest it. The progress and happiness of a people are vastly effected by those in authority. For examples we need go no farther than France and the United States. Contrast the effects of the best, with those of the worst administration, and it is clear that the duty of first importance to a nation, is the framing of righteous laws.

Had the defenders of equal rights persisted sufficiently in enforcing their defence, when the Constitution of this country was framed, and admitted no alliance with Slavery; who can imagine the prosperity and exaltation which we might have acquired. A small struggle then would have left no cause for this great and dreadful war. So it seems to a woman, whom, of course, the law has not allowed to know all about the commencement, the intermediate, or the beginning of the end.

Though the march of mind and science are ever onward, it is far better that our powers be untrammelled—that we be not compelled to waste energies in overcoming the resistance of oppression and partial laws. The voters, the boasted freemen of the land, know this, as they struggle along with obstructed toil and laborious tact, only a few of whom have secured by the right of suffrage the enactments desired. And if these whose wants are kept in view by voice, appeal and remonstrance, are obliged to suffer injustice, and writhe under the restriction of their powers; what must be the wrongs and sufferings of those who are debarred every privilege pertaining to law-making—who have no jury of their peers—no civil rights—but are compelled to submit to conditions the ruling class establishes for them? Very great! Nevertheless, by the favor of Creative Wisdom, we have advanced in some respects, and are qualified to perceive that we have both a human and divine right to develop integrally and harmoniously.

Enslaved Africans, stultified by all their inherited fear, imbecility and bondage, have at last

grown to a recognition of liberty. A consciousness of their human rights has created a most impatient submission to chains. They feel as if groaning out the last agonies of servitude and suspense; and are praying for the revolution that shall usher in the law of equity. To them the array of camps and armies is the vision of judgment—the clash of steel and the thunder of artillery are sacred music,—the wail of defeat is the whisper of spirit harbingers—the clarion of triumph is the voice of the arch-angel of Justice.

And Woman, the enslaver and the slave—the doll and the drudge—the household deity and the scape-goat of infamy;—the light of hearts and the darkness of hateful passions, has essayed to know herself. Woman, who, by the estimate placed on her knowledge—by public sentiment, ignoring her individuality and human nature, yet demanding of her the exhibition of angelic attributes,—has been made all things, that she might be individually and politically nothing;—even she has aspired to be her own judge of what she ought to be. In spite of usages and fashions which have shorn her body of strength, and held the wings of her spirit in tethers, she has grown, by interior unfoldment, to the knowledge of her capacity for self-government. Now she is calling for appreciation of her rights—for laws of which she shall be a mutual ordainer, sustainer, amender, and, if need be, abrogator. Obtaining these, she may acquire conditions to efface the defects which false institutions have entailed upon her; and to more successfully culture the human and angelic germs which God implanted in her being, and has not permitted all the passions and edicts of earth to eradicate.

She knows she is human, and wants opportunity to act worthy the gifts bestowed upon her. She feels that she is angelic, and seeks relations that favor the development of her heavenly powers, that she may become poised, independent, holy and happy.

She loves man, and, seeing that in her degradation he is a participater, craves the privilege to rise for his sake, and, hand in hand, to labor, progress and rejoice alway.

Laws will be long, perhaps ever, necessary for the arrangement and understanding of financial and commercial affairs; so let them be made in view of equal rights, irrespective of sex or color. If it be possible let them harmonise with the mandates which the finger of Omnipotence has graven in our hearts, for if these be contravened, there will be confusion and conflict.

A portion of the human family has reached the point of practical obedience to the higher law; and although to them statutes are mainly useful in their influence over those who have not reached the goal, they would have a rule of amity subserve the general good. They would not be outlaws in the land, but being fully convinced of the supreme

right of the higher mandate, hesitate to comply, though there be discrepancy between it and temporal statutes. Knowing the right, no delegated authority can obligate them to do the wrong. Peace and progress depend on obedience to highest known power. Love and duty, both to God and humanity require it; and though the multitude cry "fanaticism," Truth is imperative, above the world, and rewards her willing and devoted subjects.

Reason, Science, and Intuition are fast modifying sentiments and theories, and leading to the plane of the higher law the advanced minds of the age. I trust these minds will be directed to legislation—that they will confer together, and gain ascendency, and when the present civil commotion is hushed—when the thrilling cry "to arms" is superceded by a soothing "hail sweet peace," a dispensation of love, wisdom and justice will be established, and under the banner of Equal Rights a truly free people will attain to real virtue, and by the guidance of the magnet, Truth, secure imperishable and ever increasing blessings.

MARY E. TILLOTSON.

A Word from Iowa.

MR. EDITOR:—We are glad to hear of your effort to promote "governmental and all other reforms." We think all such efforts worthy our patronage, not only for the good they do us individually, but also for the purpose of hastening on a brighter and better future for our sons and daughters. Indeed we wish to be recognized as workers with you in so glorious an enterprise.

We are now and have been for some time engaged in democratically associating into clusters the people, of proper unfolding, in this region, for the purpose of gradually, radically and thoroughly reorganizing government in church and state, on the basis of self-government and individuality. We rally our forces together on the following central idea: In order to secure, preserve and maintain every individual's natural rights, including that of conscience, private judgment, self-government, freedom of speech, equity and individuality we associate ourselves.

You readily discover that this is a broad basis: no power of reception or excommunication. A mind naturally and properly unfolded for such association instinctively enters its arena; on the other hand, one not prepared for so broad a freedom in association, just as naturally and instinctively shrinks therefrom, or excommunicates himself. Our basis reaches to the utmost limits of all other organizations; it takes in all they have, and then reaches far beyond, including in its embrace the entire family of man; jealously guarding the natural and inherent rights of each individual, however peculiar in his constitutional being. Thus we propose to inaugurate a reform in government throughout every department; not by destroying, but by introducing and promoting on this broad platform, the highest life, light and unfolding.

As such workers we hail the forth-coming REPUBLIC as a powerful auxiliary to our cause. It will undoubtedly contain the deepest, broadest and highest wisdom of the age; and consequently meet the wants of pioneer reformers; the real reorganizers of Society.

A. P. BOWMAN.

RICHMOND, Iowa.

Epistolary.

DEAR FRIEND:—Your last letter is most interesting, and has set my mind to a new task. You say God is both male and female, and that both principles inhere in each human being. The idea is suggestive and worthy of inquiry. It will reward the thought of a woman who is confident she is not understood when she is called masculine in consequence of traits for which she feels emphatically a woman. Hence, I have been looking up and down the line of progress, and believe the theory consistent.

If it be the nature of God, it must be of his offspring. And if so, the elements are implanted for cultivation, and the perfection of the being depends on the harmonious development of both the male and the female elements. It is then inferable that some, knowing the fact, will be ignorant of the method of development, and others, all unaware of both fact and method, will so exercise their faculties as to become harmonious.

"Your happiness is not wholly dependent on circumstances, because you have cultivated both." Could I have reached the point of resignation to whatever befalls, and of reciprocal communion with the infinite fount of love, if the two were not in something like harmonious alliance? If this state be necessary to round and poise the affectional nature, is not the same true of the intellectual? Equally so, I ween; and it may be safe to premise that the person socially poised, is also intellectually. Since we can read from our own natures easier than from others, allow me to illustrate by citing self again.

There are those who call me masculine because my bearing is erect and independent. They say I reason and write like a man; and if my productions are without signature, affirm that no female mind originated them. In my opinion these productions are feminine; that is, they bear the impress of the woman nature. If positiveness and strength are characteristics, are they not simply signs that the author thinks, not imitates—that she acts as impelled by her interior forces and convictions, not as custom indicates? In short, is original, or self-regulating. And is this being less a woman, or more? If it be because the male elements of mind are exercised, am I unsexed? Am I not more a woman, as you are more a man, for cultivating all the faculties with which Deity endowed the mind? These are my conclusions. If they are erroneous, you can lend me a ray to light the path of discovery. You can understand me, and know that in these things I make no boast, and feel none; but in humility am searching for truth, and endeavoring to make application of it in the concerns of life, that this stage of existence may be as useful, as sunny and beautiful as possible, and leave me at the pearly portal of the next sphere as fully matured as may be required of my little ability.

You imply that man, to be sufficiently independent to placidly meet the changes and repulsions to which he is liable, must cultivate both the male and female elements in his nature. Hence, it is both logical and analogical to grant that the same culture is equally important to woman. (Of course it is understood that the male has due predominance in man, the female in woman.) Admitting the truth in both cases, leads to the conclusion that when the elements are developed harmoniously, we are in equilibrium; which, speaking of the affections, is perhaps another mode of saying we are above the animal, or passionnal plane. Applied to the intellect, when we think for ourselves, and act by our own knowledge, as prompted by the God in us, uninfluenced by others' views and prejudices, we are individualized.

Must not men and women attain to these conditions ere they can walk side by side in the relations and vocations of life? Must not the positive and negative forces be balanced in the sexes, ere they can love and each maintain a healthful selfhood?

There is a palpable wrong in the inequality which obtains by the absolving of one party. Excepting the few exceptions, woman has been unduly passive, and needs a great change in the field of her activities. Man is waiting, without knowing what he wants, for her firm and well-directed influence. Nations are in a state of disintegration, and her generally blending power is requisite to the construction of the dispensation of harmony.

When she has been caused to think long enough to see the work before her, and feel that she is responsible for the use of her capacities, it is hoped she will divest herself of hoops and flowing shackles; and being disengaged of both the emblems and causes of weakness, will retrieve the strength to be physically and mentally woman.

Strictly speaking, mind is mind, whatever organization develops it, and to give it a sex is paradoxical. Who would not laugh to hear of a male science, or female art?

A woman learns the same mathematics and music that man does, and just as he does. When she draws a landscape or sculptures an image, true to nature, she does so by the same process that he does. But this does not show that the two elements are not employed in the production of mind. Probably its soundness and vigor depend on the proportions in which they are blended. The mental inefficiency of many men, as well as women, is owing perchance to a disproportionate use and union.

So much for my first speculations on the topic. I wait for more light.

You see, my good friend, that when I sit down to answer your rich letters, I do but little towards it. Your rhapsodies of thought leave me nothing but amen to say; so I take up your least hint, and follow off a maze that I cannot leave till methodized.

Your conceptions of the Universe and the human soul fall on my consciousness, as does a grand, blooming and varied landscape on the retina of outward vision. They are clear, though comprehensive; new, though familiar—my spirit embraces and answers them—the external has only to say, you have pictured my sentiments and emotions; an attempt to add would cloud the view, like superfluous foliage in the foreground of the scene.

Your Night-Thoughts, reflective and philosophic, compassionate and grateful, are pleasant and interesting. In your admiration of Nature, and inclination to dwell amid her beauties—to explore her treasures, and penetrate her mysteries, my sympathies are fully enlisted.

Awaiting what it shall please you to next instruct me with, I remain thine, truly,

ETTIE EVERDALE.

(Communicated.)

The Basis of True Democracy, is a True Fraternity. A true Fraternal Recognition ignores all "titles," from that of High Priest, down to that of Porter: for titles ever create *distinctions*, which always engender the *love of rule*. Popery is an outgrowth of Religious Despotism; and Monarchy is the offspring of Political Tyranny. The combined power of the two, has been the prolific cause of every form of oppression; and the culmination of this power is about to sound the death knell of all the Old Dynasties, which have borne sway so long. And while the Old is waning, wasting, dying, the New is rising and holding (by a Power which is invincible, immutable, eternal—the Power of Attraction) the rapt gaze of the Seer into the Law of Cause and Effect.

The Work now required of Monarchs, Kings and Potentates, who have passed from the Outer to the Inner Life, is to aid, through the Inspirations of the Unitary Power of the Orderly Heavens, (which they have come to recognize,) in the establishment of a True Democracy, over against the Oligarchies of the Past. This Power is now to manifest itself, by breaking in pieces, like a "potter's vessel," all clans, cliques, and institutions where the few think, speak, and act for the many. Hence, now the clamor of the Babel—the Old World—because of this usurped power. Hence "wars and rumors of wars," which are to the forth-coming future, what the distant, muttering thunder is to the coming storm!—a precursor of what is to be.—This Power is to enter into the Courts of so-called Justice and Equity;—into the vaults where the financial treasures are buried:—into the former, to tear into shreds, the parchments, dignified with the name of Law:—into the latter, unlocking the safes, and scattering the hoarded gold to the four winds of Heaven.

And the "hand writing" is to appear on the walls of the Banking and Legal Institutions—"Thou art weighed in the balance, and art found wanting." The day of thy doom has come!—The gloom of the night of the past, which thy united effort has thrown, like the pall of death, over the Social, Religious and Political departments of Life, is to be dispelled by the descending inspiration of the Heavenly Host, whose demand now is, that thou shalt "reap what thou hast sown:"—if to the "flesh" only, 'tis "corruption"—'tis death. If thou hast nurtured Spirit, as well, (which is Eternal Principle,) then thou shalt rise into the New Life, by virtue of the *deeds done*, for this must be the foundation of the New—a Basis which cannot be shaken.

What is the New, in contradistinction to the Old? It is the Breath of the Infinite, coming like the dashing surges of the Mighty Deep upon the shore. It is Spirit calling unto Spirit;—Life responding to Life;—thought answering thought for mighty deeds: thus demonstrating Spirit Power, *deed-wise* and not word-wise.—The Age of Theories now gives way to actualities, which shall stir to the very depths of conscious life, and thus rouse into vigorous play, all the faculties of being. The New Jerusalem, now descending to Earth, is the Life of the Redeemed Hosts of the Celestial Heavens, inflowing into the organisms of Male and Female, to enable them to solve the problem—What is God?—What is the Creative Power?—It is the Power which Incarnates Divinity in Humanity, by bringing the Sphere of Art, out into bold relief, just as the Old is passing away, to form the back-ground of the picture—thus presenting an attraction to that sphere, which has ever been, since Creation's dawn, considered one of degradation, because it is the sphere of coercive Labor. Hence it is, that, instead of emulating labor, and thus furnishing a stimulus for action among all classes, the grand desideratum has been—how to live without labor. The problem is yet unsolved—how to live without labor. The solution of this problem is Redemption—redemption which consists in calling all the faculties of being into requisition.

Then will Genius awake from its long, long sleep, and be called back to Earth again. Long ago, it wrapped its mantle in deep folds about it, and retired from the Earth; for the coercive principle was far from being able to command its exercise. But it comes now, at the call of the resurrected spirit, asking, in deep earnestness,—"What shall we do?" It comes to give labor a *charm*, which shall draw all unto it. It seeks ingress, first, into Woman's being, to stimulate her to be self-sustaining—that she may no longer stand in the way of the World's Progress;—for, the Law of Generation is such, that,

"Like Mother, like Child" is not simply an adage, but a Law of Life. You cannot have a Nation of Free Men, till you have a nation of free Women.

Woman can only give birth to that which *she* has attained. Hence, in order to have a just and equitable Government, a just and equitable Commerce, and a Just Social State, Woman must rally, that the balance Power may be found, which is the pearl of priceless value, because it regulates all the departments of human effort.

Genius, thus roused, and descended to Earth, speaks to Woman, saying: Deck thyself with garments of thy own weaving—with colors of thy own blending—with the Form and Statue of thy own creating. Then thou wilt present to Man, a stimulus to create that which will make labor in thy sphere attractive. Then the two, by mutual cooperation, will put an end to oppression; for labor is no longer exacted by the Law of Coercion.—It now becomes Worship. Thus Church and State, being married, the Social Element comes in to form its part of the beautiful Trinity, which represents the God-Head—Three in One. The three-fold cord being now formed, which brings Heaven to Earth, Babylon, which is constituted of the Kingdoms of "this World," and whose genius is the coercive Principle, falls, never again to rise; and out of these desolving elements, comes the New Creation, whose foundation is laid in this rudimental sphere, but whose Dome and Apex reach into the Unknown—the Eternal!

Letter from Virginia.

HAMPTON, VIRGINIA,
Near Fortress Monroe,

April 2d, 1862.

DEAR F.—The more I see of this war and watch the people's progress when stubborn facts come before them, the better I am satisfied that the whole movement is under the control of higher and, to us, unseen intelligences. I am satisfied that the Nation is fast working up to an abolition basis, and that the war will never be closed until the cause is prostrated. I do not believe that the Slave Power is yet broken, nor that anything short of desperate fighting will destroy their hopes of ultimate success. I have the best means of knowing that they have 350,000 men in the field, and an almost unanimous white population in favor of holding out to the end—at least in the Cotton States.

The Slavery invented falsehood, that the negroes cannot live unless forced and cared for by the Whites, is exploded as fast as the army marches. The contrabands are a very industrious people as a class. Every one at Fortress Monroe is employed by the Government and until very lately stopped, cheated out of their pay by Quarter Master Captain Tallmadge, who has been charging the Government for the work done by the numerous contrabands, and then putting the money into his own pocket.

The officers of the old Regular Army, are nearly all pro-slavery; while the reverse is true of the officers who have come to the army of the Volunteers; of this being

the natural result, with men always in command, I need not tell you.

The contrabands at Fort Monroe, were looked after by some of our New England philanthropists, and this cheating process was discovered to be almost universal—the poor abused creatures having worked hard for months without getting one cent except food. This examination led to the sending a man from Boston, named Wilder, a good and christian man, to reside at Fortress Monroe and take entire charge of the contrabands. This was done with the approbation of General Wool who is an honest, humane and brave man, daring to face the canon's mouth, and to do what is right—more courageous still. Comfortable buildings were erected and the slaves were made as comfortable as they could be under the circumstances. Mr. Wilder refused to allow the contrabands to work for Capt. Tallmadge in Government employ or otherwise unless they were paid from \$10 to \$15 per month and rations. This made Capt. Tallmadge mad—he having in his pocket \$10,000 belonging to these hard working and unpaid contrabands. He threatened if Mr. Wilder did not desist, he would have the buildings, erected by charity for the use of the contrabands, torn down and shoved off from the Government land. Mr. Wilder knew his strength, and defied Capt. Tallmadge, also, reporting him to Gen. Wool, who gave him a severe reprimand, indicating something worse if Capt. Tallmadge repeated his outrage. Gen'l Wool ordered Mr. Wilder to see that the contrabands were all paid for all their labor and to collect the same of Capt. Tallmadge.

* * * * *

A relative of James G. Birney—a brother, I hear, and an officer in the regular army, came here some time ago, in charge of an encampment, and one Saturday night, while raining hard, he went into Tyler's house and turned out men women and children of the contrabands—some 50 in number—taking possession and making himself comfortable quarters. Mr. Wilder brought the facts to the notice of Gen. Wool, who quickly, with his mounted Staff, rode to Capt. Birney's quarters and ordered him out and the colored people back again, rebuking Capt. Birney as he richly deserved.

Such are among the hundreds of outrages inflicted upon these unoffending people under the mad dog cry of "Nigger, Nigger."

* * * * *

Each day we have been looking for the Merrimac to make her appearance, and renew the attack; but still she does not come as yet.

I trust and believe that our mighty army will make long strides within a very few days, and you may expect to hear of noble and daring achievements.

The mail closes and I must stop right here. More anon.

S. P.

To Contributors.

Prof. POWELL.—Your "Very Valuable Discovery" will appear in our next issue.

ORSON S. MURRAY.—Your Article is in type but is unavoidably crowded out.

MILO A. TOWNSEND.—Thank you. Send the article referred to; and any others.

L. C. TODD.—Your Letter will appear next week.

S. P.—Nothing but a relentless physical necessity would have induced us to leave out any part of your interesting letter. We shall do a great many bad things before we do the like again.